



**TRANSPORT AND WORKS ACT 1992**

**TRANSPORT AND WORKS (INQUIRIES  
PROCEDURE) RULES 2004**

**THE NETWORK RAIL  
(SUFFOLK  
LEVEL CROSSING REDUCTION)  
ORDER**

---

**SUSAN TILBROOK**

**REBUTTAL  
PROOF OF EVIDENCE**

**-FOR-**

**S25 CATTISHALL**

Document Reference	NR/32/4/8
--------------------	-----------

# Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	S25 Cattishall	2

# 1 Introduction

- 1.1 This Rebuttal Proof of Evidence has been prepared on behalf of Network Rail to respond to particular matters raised in the Proofs of Evidence submitted on behalf of the following parties which were received by Network Rail on 18 January 2018. These include the Proofs of Evidence of:
  - 1.1.1 Suffolk County Council (OBJ/29)
    - a) Andrew Woodin
    - b) Abdul Razaq
- 1.2 It is not intended that this rebuttal proof should address matters that have already been addressed in my Proof of Evidence (NR32/1) or of other witnesses for the Promoter; however, cross references to relevant parts of that evidence are given below, where appropriate. The fact that I have not expressly rebutted a point does not mean that it is accepted.
- 1.3 I believe the facts and opinions stated to be true and that my evidence conforms to the standards and requirements of my professional body.

## 2 S25 Cattishall

### 2.1 Modification to Order

2.1.1 *At paragraph 8 of his Proof of Evidence (Obj29), Andrew Woodin states that “it is noted the proposal includes creating a bridleway between points A and P022. This section is already recorded highway and has a metalled surface. If the Secretary of State is minded to accept this crossing proposal, the council requests the Order is modified accordingly.”*

2.1.2 In response, if there is highway designated between points A and P022 but it does not allow a right of way on horseback or leading a horse, then Network Rail is content to amend the Order to re-designate that section of highway to a bridleway.

### 2.1 Diversion distances

2.1.1 *At paragraph 8 of his Proof of Evidence (Obj29), Andrew Woodin states that the diversion route “constitutes roughly an additional 15 minutes, or 30 minutes on a return journey.”*

2.1.2 In response, I have covered the additional distances that are required, and additional walking speeds and times in sections 2.15.12 to 2.15.15 of my Proof of Evidence. I am satisfied that the additional distance is approximately 860m and would take approximately 11 minutes longer than the existing route.

2.1.3 *At paragraph 17 of his Proof of Evidence (Obj29), Andrew Woodin states that “the second of the two aims of the Suffolk Walking Strategy (Active For Life Suffolk Walking Strategy 2015-2020 is that walking becomes the ‘default’ choice for journeys of 20 minutes walking time or less. This is about the time it would take to walk from Cattishall to the Sybil Andrews Academy on the existing route, but the route proposed in the TWAO would significantly exceed this time.*

2.1.4 In response, I have discussed the existing use of the level crossing in paragraphs 2.15.6 and 2.15.7. With reference to the census survey shown in NR25, in the context of walking use, it can be seen that the survey was undertaken in term time and that the usage figures show 58 adults used the crossing during the Monday to Friday survey period as opposed to 1 accompanied child who used the level crossing on Tuesday 28/6/16. The consultation feedback showed that the level crossing was mainly for leisure purposes and no feedback responses received stated that the level crossing was used to access local amenities.

2.1.5 Based on the census survey, feedback from consultation and the assessment of the wider highway/PROW network, there is no evidence to suggest that that access to Sybil Andrews Academy for existing users will be affected by the closure of the level crossing.

### 2.2 Health

2.2.1 *At paragraph 2(l) of his Proof of Evidence (Obj29), Abdul Razaq states that closure of the level crossing will lead “individuals, particularly older members of the community, becoming isolated from services within their local communities which could have a negative impact on their emotional wellbeing.”*

2.2.2 In response, I have discussed the existing use of the level crossing in paragraphs 2.15.6 and 2.15.7. With reference to the census survey shown in NR25, in the context of walking use, it can be seen that the survey was undertaken in term time and that the usage figures show 180 adults used the crossing during the 9 days survey period. A total of 6 children were recorded. No elderly, no impaired, no wheelchair and no mobility scooters were shown to use the level

crossing. The consultation feedback showed that the level crossing was mainly for leisure purposes and no feedback responses received stated that the level crossing was used to access local amenities.

- 2.2.3 I am satisfied that the level crossing closure will not adversely affected the user groups suggested by Suffolk County Council.

